

Remarks

Claims 9 through 12 are in prosecution and are under final rejection.

Claims 9 and 12 are rejected as anticipated by McLaughlin (US 6,421,570).

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected as obvious under McLaughlin in view of Hamlin (US 6,310,888). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 11 is amended to correct an inadvertent misspelling.

The drawings are objected to under Rule 83(a) as not showing every feature of the claims. It appears that Examiner is objecting to the claim language that all entry point nodes are followed by a data processing node, whereas Fig. 3 shows one entry point node (323) that does not require any further processing of the data message and is not followed by another data processing node. Claim 9 is amended to avoid this interpretation.

The specification is objected to as not providing antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Again, this seems to refer to the claim language and the drawing objection discussed above. Therefore the amendment to claim 9 should resolve this objection. If this is incorrect in Examiner's thinking, further clarification is requested.

Claim 11 is objected to on the grounds that "the limitation ending in "message:" does not appear to act as a preamble for the selecting step. The claim is amended to overcome this objection.

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph since the limitation "the publisher applications" lacks antecedent basis. The claim should have recited "publisher application", so now the claim is amended to fix this error.

The rejection of claims 9 and 12 is now addressed. The rejection specifically relies on McLaughlin's col. 6 line 47-col. 7 line 26 and Fig. 1 for teaching the features of claim 1. However, while McLaughlin teaches a publish/subscribe system, his publish/subscribe system is a completely different architecture as compared to that of Applicant's claim 1. Specifically, McLaughlin teaches, as shown in Figs. 2 and 3, and in col. 6 lines 47 to col. 7 line 26, that the publisher nodes and the subscriber nodes communicate directly with each other (not via a broker as claimed in Applicant's claim 1). In col. 6 lines 55 to 57, McLaughlin describes that each subscriber node sends separate subscription messages to the publisher nodes. In McLaughlin, each publisher node then performs the task of maintaining this information for each subscriber and acting accordingly by sending publication messages to the appropriate subscribers based on the previously received subscription data.

However, Applicant's claimed invention uses a completely different publish/subscribe architecture where the publisher applications (e.g., 310a, 310b in Fig. 3) do not need to maintain any subscription data about each subscriber application (e.g., 33) since the broker 320 takes care of this. The broker acts as an intermediary between the publishers and the subscribers, thus freeing the publisher and subscribers from having to know details about each other. This is completely different from the McLaughlin architecture, as described above, where the publishers have to maintain details about the specific requirements of the various subscribers. Therefore, the features of claim 1 which recite the communication between the publisher and the subscriber take place via a broker are clearly not taught or suggested by McLaughlin.

Furthermore, the more specific features of claim 1 are also not taught by McLaughlin. For example, the broker is constructed of a plurality of publication point nodes that serve as entry points selectable by subscribers, some of which are followed by a unique series of other data processing nodes for transforming a message. Neither of these claimed features is disclosed by McLaughlin.

McLaughin passes messages between publishers and subscribers, but no transformation of messages is taught, and especially no transformation according to the selection of an entry point publication point node.

Applicants stipulate that it is known to translate data from a source into a different form for a destination, as taught by Hamlin. All of the cited art has been reviewed and are not considered to adversely affect the patentability of the claims as now presented.

Accordingly, it is believed that there is no factual support for the rejection's conclusion that claims 9 through 12 are anticipated or made obvious by the art.

Respectfully Submitted,


Jerry W. Herndon
Attorney Representing Applicant
Reg. No. 27,901

IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law
Department T81/Building 503
P.O. Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

(919) 543-3754
FAX: 919-254-4330
Email: herndonj@us.ibm.com